

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23, 26, and 29 are pending. Claims 13 and 29 were amended to correct deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 13-15, 20, 21, and 26

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 13-15, 20, 21, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,625,624) in view of Mathur et al. (U.S. Patent 6,704,807).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is novel and patentable over Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) in view of Mathur et al. (hereinafter Mathur).

As stated in column 1, lines 58-61 of Chen, Chen is directed to a "system and method of providing information retrieved from a server from across a communication network that enables archiving services that do not interfere with existing components and protocols." Applicants agree with the Examiner's previous statement that that Chen does not disclose "a first memory having a plurality of first slots," which is stated in independent claim 1.

The Examiner, combining Mathur with Chen, alleges that Mathur teaches a plurality of processes, the memory having a plurality of slots, each slot being assigned to one of the plurality of processes and configured to store data to be transmitted or received by the assigned process. The Examiner refers to column 7, line 61 to column 8, line 14 in Mathur, which states:

"In one embodiment of the [Mathur] invention, kernel 214 is designed specifically for small, fast, embedded devices. In this embodiment, the kernel supports a single 4GB address space. In an embodiment of the invention, this 4GB address space is divided into 33 "slots," each of which has a size of 32MB. The kernel protects each process by assigning each process to a unique, open slot in memory. The [Mathur] invention, however, is not limited to any particular physical or virtual address space or slot size, and other sizes may be chosen as those of skill in the art will recognize."

Although Mathur appears to disclose a method of assigning memory slots to a process, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. Chen does not disclose or teach a system and method of providing information retrieved from a server, wherein the system is

designed specifically for small, fast, embedded devices. In column 2, lines 58-64 of Mathur, Mathur further discloses "a system is presented that includes a set of Application Program Interfaces (APIs) for a number of software modules and components for resource limited environments. One example of a resource limited environment is the embedded system, which comprises a variety of consumer devices and specialized industrial controllers, along with hand-held, or palm-size personal computers." Chen is completely void of any reference to resource limited environments. Thus, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1 is novel and patentable over Chen in view of Mathur.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 is novel and patentable over Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) in view of Mathur et al. (hereinafter Mathur). Chen does not disclose "a shared memory having a plurality of slots to store data to be transmitted and received by processes via the proxy; each slot being assigned to a particular one of the process," which is stated in independent claim 10. The Examiner, combining Mathur with Chen, alleges that Mathur teaches a plurality of processes, the memory having a plurality of slots, each slot being assigned to one of the plurality of processes and configured to store data to be transmitted or received by the assigned process. Although Mathur appears to discloses a method of assigning memory slots to a process, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. Chen does not disclose or teach a system and method of providing information retrieved from a server, wherein the system is designed specifically for small, fast, embedded devices. Chen is void of any reference to resource limited environments (i.e., embedded devices). Thus, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 10 is novel and patentable over Chen in view of Mathur.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 13 is novel and patentable over Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) in view of Mathur et al. (hereinafter Mathur). Independent claim 13 relates to a method of independent claim 1. Although Mathur appears to disclose a method of assigning memory slots to a process, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. Chen does not disclose or teach a system and method of providing information retrieved from a server, wherein the system is designed specifically for small, fast, embedded devices.

Chen is completely void of any reference to resource limited environments (i.e., embedded devices). Thus, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 13 is novel and patentable over Chen in view of Mathur.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 26 is novel and patentable over Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) in view of Mathur et al. (hereinafter Mathur).

Independent claim 26 relates to a method of independent claim 1. Although Mathur appears to disclose a method of assigning memory slots to a process, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. Chen does not disclose or teach a system and method of providing information retrieved from a server, wherein the system is designed specifically for small, fast, embedded devices. Chen is void of any reference to resource limited environments (i.e., embedded devices). Thus, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 26 is novel and patentable over Chen in view of Mathur.

Claims 4-5, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 16-19, 22-23, and 29

Claims 4-5, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 16-19, 22-23, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne et al. (U.S. Patent 6,557,056).

For reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur, and therefore, claims 4, 5, 6, and 7 depending therefrom patentable at least for this reason.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne. Applicants agree with the Examiner's previous statement that that Chen and Mathur do not disclose "the mark devices being assigned to the first slots and being operable to indicate whether data can be written or read from the first slots by the first processes," as recited in claim 9.

The Examiner, combining Lanteigne with Chen and Mathur, alleges that Lanteigne teaches mark devices being assigned to the slots and being operable to indicate

whether data can be written or read from the slots by the processes. The Examiner refers to column 6, lines 7-36 and column 9, lines 37-42 in Lanteigne.

Column 6, lines 7-36 of Lanteigne disclose queues, wherein there are two general ways to access a queue: enqueue and dequeue. An enqueue describes an operation whereby an element (i.e., message) is stored into the queue. The enqueue always stored the data immediately after the most recently enqueued element in the queue by using the queue write pointer. A dequeue describes an operation whereby an element (i.e., message) is removed from the queue. A dequeue always attempts to remove the oldest element in the queue by using the queue read pointer.

Although Lanteigne disclose queues, the queues of Lanteigne do not disclose the ability to indicate whether data can be written or read from the memory slots by the processes. Even if one were to argue that Lanteigne discloses the ability to indicate whether data can be written or read from the memory slots by the processes, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. Chen does not disclose or teach a system and method of providing information retrieved from a server, wherein the system is designed specifically for small, fast, embedded devices. In column 2, lines 58-64 of Mathur, Mathur further discloses "a system is presented that includes a set of Application Program Interfaces (APIs) for a number of software modules and components for resource limited environments. One example of a resource limited environment is the embedded system, which comprises a variety of consumer devices and specialized industrial controllers, along with hand-held, or palm-size personal computers." Chen is completely void of any reference to resource limited environments. Thus, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 9 is novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne.

For reasons stated in the section above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne. Similarly, claim 13 is allowable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 22 is novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne.

Applicants agree with the Examiner's previous statement that that Chen and Mathur does not disclose "a plurality of mark devices that are assigned to each of the slots to regulate the data flow into and out of the slots," which is stated in independent claim 22.

The Examiner, combining Lanteigne with Chen and Mathur, alleges that Lanteigne teaches mark devices for regulating the data flow into and out of the slots. The Examiner refers to column 6, lines 7-36 and column 9, lines 37-42 in Lanteigne.

Column 6, lines 7-36 of Lanteigne disclose queues, wherein there are two general ways to access a queue: enqueue and dequeue. An enqueue describes an operation whereby an element (i.e., message) is stored into the queue. The enqueue always stored the data immediately after the most recently enqueued element in the queue by using the queue write pointer. A dequeue describes an operation whereby an element (i.e., message) is removed from the queue. A dequeue always attempts to remove the oldest element in the queue by using the queue read pointer.

Although Lanteigne disclose queues, the queues of Lanteigne do not disclose the ability to regulate the data flow into and out of memory slots. Even if one were to argue that Lanteigne discloses the ability to regulate the data flow into and out of memory slots, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. Chen does not disclose or teach a system and method of providing information retrieved from a server, wherein the system is designed specifically for small, fast, embedded devices. In column 2, lines 58-64 of Mathur, Mathur further discloses "a system is presented that includes a set of Application Program Interfaces (APIs) for a number of software modules and components for resource limited environments. One example of a resource limited environment is the embedded system, which comprises a variety of consumer devices and specialized industrial controllers, along with hand-held, or palm-size personal computers." Chen is completely void of any reference to resource limited environments. Thus, there is no motivation to combine Mathur with Chen. For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 22 is novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne.

Appl. No. 09/770,762
Amdt. dated June 27, 2005
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2154

PATENT

For reasons stated in the section above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 26 is novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur, and therefore, claim 29 depending therefrom are novel and patentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Y. Cho
Reg. No. 44,612

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
SYC:gjs
60402988 v1